



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,648	08/31/2001	Thomas Edward Dinan	SJO9-2000-0009US1	1799

32112 7590 12/09/2003

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW OFFICE
1901 S. BASCOM AVENUE, SUITE 660
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

EXAMINER

CHEN, TIANJIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2652

11

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,648

Applicant(s)

DINAN ET AL.

Examiner

Tianjie Chen

Art Unit

2652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9,10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Final Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohtsuka et al (US 5,774,308).

With regard to claim 19, Ohtsuka et al shows a magnetic head in Fig. 7 including: a substrate 21; a read head 22 (Column 7, line 47) being fabricated upon the substrate; a P1 pole 24 (Column 7, line 37) being fabricated upon the read head; a write gap layer 27 being fabricated upon the P1 pole; a P2 pole tip 26 being fabricated upon portions of the write gap layer, wherein the P2 pole tip includes a base surface 26c that is disposed upon the write gap layer 27 and a side wall surface 26b that is disposed generally perpendicularly to the base surface, and wherein the base surface and the side wall surface are comprised of a P2 pole tip seed layer material FeN.

With regard to claim 20, Ohtsuka et al further shows that the base surface defines a width W of the P2 pole tip and the sidewall defines a thickness t of the P2 pole tip.

With regard to claim 21, Ohtsuka further shows that the P2 pole tip further

Art Unit: 2652

includes an electroplated material portion 26a, and wherein the electroplated (Column 6, lines 24-26) material portion is formed in part upon the sidewall surface seed layer material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honjo et al (US 6,466,416).

With regard to claims 1 and 6, Honjo et al shows a magnetic head (Figs. 3 and 4) including: a substrate 1; a read head 4 being fabricated upon the substrate; a P1 pole 6 being fabricated upon the read head; a write gap layer 7 being fabricated upon the P1 pole; a P2 pole tip 11 being fabricated upon portions of the write gap layer, wherein the P2 pole tip includes a first portion (front portion) being comprised of a magnetic layer material 14 (Fig. 4; column 9, lines 19-22) and a second portion 11 being comprised of electroplated material (Column 9, lines 22-25), and wherein the P2 pole tip has a width dimension W that is formed in part from a thickness of the seed layer material portion and in part from a thickness of the electroplated material portion (Fig. 4).

With regard to claim 6, Honjo et al further shows the magnetic head is used for a hard disk drive (Column 1, lines 6-7) inheriting at least one hard disk being

Art Unit: 2652

fabricated for rotary motion upon a disk drive; at least one magnetic head adapted to fly over the hard disk for writing data on the hard disk.

Honjo et al does not name layer 14 as seed layer.

However, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that layer 14 is also a seed layer. The rationale is as follows: Honjo et al teaches that layer 14 is formed by physical vapor deposition (which is not electroplating) (Column 9, lines 62-53) and used for supplying electric current when third layer 11 is formed by electroplating method (Column 9, lines 19-21); therefore, the layer 14 functions as a seed layer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Honjo et al's teaching to recognize layer 14 as a seed layer.

With regard to claims 2 and 7, Honjo et al further shows the first portion of the P2 pole tip that is comprised of the seed layer material 14 forms a sidewall of the P2 pole tip.

With regard to claims 3 and 8, Honjo et al further shows the seed layer material 14 is formed with a thickness of 100 Å (column 12, lines 31-32), which is approximately 50 Å to approximately 500 Å, and the electroplated material 11 is formed with a thickness of 5000 Å (Column 12, lines 43-44).

With regard to claims 4 and 9; Honjo et al further shows the electroplated material 11 having thickness of 1000 Å or more (Column 12, line 51-52), which is approximately 1500 Å; and the seed layer material thickness is more than 50 Å and less 1000 Å (Column 12, lines 33-42), but does not show it is approximately 250 Å.

However, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to include 250 Å as the thickness of the seed layer. The

Art Unit: 2652

rationale is as follows: Honjo et al teaches that the seed layer material thickness should falls in the range of more then 50 Å and less 1000 Å for balancing the good layer quality and the writing capability (Column 12, lines 33-42). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Honjo et al's teaching to find a suitable thickness through experimentation and optimization, which would include 250 Å.

With regard to claims 5 and 10, Honjo et al further shows that the seed layer material 14 is NiFe, which is comprised of NiFe (Column 12, line 31) and the electroplated material 11 is CoNiFe, which is comprised of NiFe (Column 12, line 42-43).

3. Claims 22 -24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohtsuka et al in view of Honjo et al (US 6,466,416).

With regard to claims 22 and 23, Ohtsuka et al further shows the seed layer material is formed with a thickness of 0.1 micron (1000 Å; column 7, lines 56-58) and the electroplated material having thickness of 3 microns (30000 Å; column 7, lines 59-65); but does not show the seed layer material thickness is approximately 50 Å to 500Å (or 250 Å) and the electroplated material thickness is approximately 100 Å to 5000 Å (or 1500 Å).

However, Honjo et al shows a magnetic head, wherein the seed layer material 14 is formed with a thickness of 100 Å (column 12, lines 31-32), which is approximately 50 Å to approximately 500 Å, and the electroplated material 11 is formed with a thickness of 5000 Å (Column 12, lines 43-44).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the following rage: the seed layer material thickness

Art Unit: 2652

is approximately 50 Å to 500Å (or 250 Å) and the electroplated material thickness is approximately 100 Å to 5000 Å (or 1500 Å). The rationale is as follows: Applicant does not specify a particular reason for use this particular thickness. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been determining the suitable thickness through experimentations and optimization. Ohtsuka et al's patent was filed in 1996, which is much earlier than the time this invention was made. Thinning the thickness to upgrade the data rate is a well-known trend in the art. Honjo has taught of using thinner thickness of the layers and teaches that the seed layer material thickness should falls in the range of more then 50 Å and less 1000 Å for balancing the good layer quality and the writing capability (Column 12, lines 33-42). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by Honjo et al's teaching and follow the trend in the art to find a suitable thickness through experimentation and optimization, which would include the following range: the seed layer material is formed with a thickness approximately 50 Å to 500Å (or 250 Å) and the electroplated material thickness is approximately 100 Å to 5000 Å (or 1500 Å).

With regard to claim 24, Ohtsuka et al shows the seed layer material is made of FeN film with high saturation magnetic flux density Of 2 T (Column 5, lines 49-58) and the electroplated material 26c is made of NiFe (Column 7, lines 56); but fails to show that the seed layer material is comprised of NiFe.

Honjo et al shows that CoNiFe, which is comprised of NiFe, has high saturation magnetic flux density of 1.9-2.2 T (Column 5, lines 18-19).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to include CoNiFe as a candidate for the seed layer. The rationale is as follows: in Ohtsuka et al, the seed layer needs to have high saturation

Art Unit: 2652

magnetic flux density of 2T, CoNiFe has saturation magnetic flux density of 1.9–2.2 T. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include CoFeNi as a material for the seed layer.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 09/29/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the features recited above) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- Width is not specifically defined in claims; therefore, it can be counted as from the bottom to the top in Honjo et al.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date


Art Unit: 2652

of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tianjie Chen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7499. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30, Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoa Nguyen can be reached on (703) 305-9687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)746-6037.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chen Tianjie".

Tianjie Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2652
12/04/2003